UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,288	04/27/2001	Shuvranshu Pokhariyal	10559/408001/P10345	9993

20985 7590 06/24/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
12390 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081

EXAMINER	
OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/844,288	POKHARIYAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael N. Opsasnick	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishnan (6,233,559) in view of Scott et al (6101473).

As per claim 1-4, 12-16, and 22-25, 34,35,37,38,40,41, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) teaches:

receiving information about a recognized phrase from a speech recognition engine (col. 4, lines 18-19 and 31-33);

selecting, based on the recognized phrase an inherent handler function and handling information from sets of handling information associated with a different application, based on identifying the application that is a focus of the recognized phrase (col. 4, lines 35-40 and 47-51);

having first located the sets of handling information, when the execution of the associated application is initiated (col. 5, lines 1-5).

loading a first grammar for a first application that is automatically selected and loading a second different grammar for a second automatically recognized application (col. 4 lines 40-66)

As per claims 1,12, and 22, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) does not explicitly teach the speech engine separate from the applications themselves, however, Scott et al (6101473) teaches the speech server to be separate from the applications themselves (Fig. 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Balakrishnan with a separate speech engine because it would advantageously allow for more than one application to access the speech engine (Scott et al, col. 2 line 65 – col. 3 line 2).

The combination of Balakrishnan (6,233,559) in view of Scott et al (6101473) does not explicitly teach "utilizing a first API at a speech service separate for the speech engine.....first application programming interface", however, Comerford et al (6748361) teaches separate user interface files on a different platform, separate from the spoken

language engines (Fig. 3, subblock 330, subblock 3200, and subblock 3420). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of speech interfaces at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Balakrishnan (6,233,559) in view of Scott et al (6101473) to include separate handling functions for the speech because it would offer a more flexible speech interface (Comerford et al (6748361), col. 5 lines 40-47).

As per claim 5, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) teaches downloading the applications and potentially the speech engine for the user (col. 3 line 55 – col. 4 line10).

As per claims 6, 9, 10, 17, 20, 21, 26, 29, and 30, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) teaches:

detecting a change of focus from a first to a second application (col. 4, lines 45-47);

inherently producing a second grammar based on the handling information associated with the second application and loading the second grammar into the speech recognizer engine (col. 5, lines 16-18 with Figure 2, elements 44, 48, or 46 and 50);

directing the operating system to provide notification in response to the focus changing and receiving notification from an operating system (col. 4, lines 41-45 with col. 5, lines 1-5).

As per claims 7, 18, 27, and 28, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) does not teach generating an uncompiled grammar based on the handling information and compiling it into a binary format. However, it would have been obvious for an artisan at the time of invention to do this (if it had not been already done) to enable the speech recognizer to properly interpret the input speech commands.

As per claims 8, 19, and 28, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) does not teach unloading a first grammar associated with the first application from the speech engine. However, it would have been obvious for an artisan at the time of invention to do this when focus has shifted away from the first application so that the speech recognizer would not have to consider irrelevant commands.

As per claim 11, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) does not explicitly teach loading the grammar for a second engine onto the speech engine when the focus is changed from a third application to the second application. However, it would have been obvious for an artisan at the time of invention to do this (if it had not already been done) to enable the speech recognizer to properly interpret the commands for the second application.

As per claims 36,39,42, Balakrishnan (6,233,559) teaches sapi and jsapi (Fig. 3, subblocks 32,34, and 102).

4. Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishnan (6233559) in view of Scott et al (6101473) in view of Comerford et al (6748361) in further view of Weber (6532444).

As per claims 31-33, Balakrishnan (6233559) in view of Scott et al (6101473) in view of Comerford et al (6748361) does not explicitly teach wildcard options for the recognized phrase, however, Weber (6532444) teaches context specific grammars (abstract) wherein wildcards are utilized (col. 8 line 63 – col. 9 line 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of speech control processing to modify the context grammar of Balakrishnan (6233559) in view of Scott et al (6101473) in view of Comerford et al (6748361)with a wildcard function because it would allow for user specific facts to be stored (Weber (6532444), col. 3 lines 30-35).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see related art listed on the PTO-892 form.

7. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
or faxed to:
(703) 872 9314,
(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Wayne Young, can be reached at (571)272-7582. The facsimile phone number for this group is (571)272-7629.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (571)272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno

6/20/05

Michael N. Opsasnick
Examiner
Art Unit 2655